

MEMORANDUM FOR THE RECORD

17 April 1957

25X1A9a

FROM: [REDACTED]

SUBJECT: CI/CE Familiarization Course

25X1A9a

25X1A9a

1. [REDACTED] submitted a draft outline for the course which he had drawn up after receiving OTR's tentative outline. In the "purposes" of his outline he stated that the course was intended for "the higher clerical grades and the lower officer grades". He appears to believe that a totally different course should be developed for supervisors, one made up largely of guest lecturers and run along the lines of the CSR course. [REDACTED] questioned the validity of this comparison because of the considerably different content and purpose. [REDACTED] expressed the hope that a basic outline could be developed which would serve both the supervisors and the workers on the theory that the supervisors needed closer acquaintance with the actual work involved in CI/CE. She made allowance for certain adjustments which would make the course appropriate at both levels. [REDACTED] appeared to show sympathy for this proposal. [REDACTED] indicated that all CE officers would continue to take the CEO course, apparently on the supposition that they are adequately oriented in CI/CE. However, [REDACTED] stated that the CE survey done by CI/R&A at Headquarters only, showed the CE people to be generally rather weak in CI/CE training, and he said with some emphasis that many of these people do not actually understand their responsibilities and spend a great deal of time trying to find out what to do with the "papers".

25X1A9a

25X1A9a

25X1A9a

25X1A9a

25X1A9a

25X1A9a

25X1A9a

25X1A9a

25X1A9a

2. Although [REDACTED] did not offer specific recommendations for course content he objected to portions of both proposed outlines and seemed primarily interested in records maintenance. At the same time he did seem to agree with [REDACTED] view that greater emphasis should be given to our CI/CE responsibilities to the intelligence community. [REDACTED] disagreed rather drastically on the matter of course content but not in specific terms, and they also expressed differing views on whether the course should be slanted to field and headquarters or to headquarters only. [REDACTED] thinks the headquarters group should be dealt with first, both groups should be taken into account while [REDACTED] thinks the headquarters group should be dealt with first.

25X1A9a

25X1A9a
25X1A9a

3. [redacted] stated that proposals are before Mr. Angleton and [redacted] for some standardized procedures and responsibilities, mainly for records maintenance, but he did not appear hopeful that they can soon be put into effect and pointed out that the CI Staff is not now in a position to do more than make recommendations which the branches may or may not follow. He called attention to a portion of [redacted] released on 26 October 1956 which helps to clarify responsibilities between host and denied area divisions and said that this should cut down some of the duplication of work which has been the result of the confusion in DDP over specific responsibilities. Despite the differences in procedures in the various branches reflected in the CE survey, [redacted] said that about ten CI/CE functions emerged as being basic to every branch. He gave [redacted] permission to review these and to study the survey itself.

25X1A

25X1A9a

25X1A9a

25X1A9a

25X1A9a

25X1A9a

4. [redacted] reiterated his (and apparently [redacted] opinion that OTR's proposed outline bears too great a resemblance to the present CEO course. [redacted] explained that the current plan is to condense or eliminate the portions of the CEO course which now take up the first three or four days. With the organization of the new course these portions would be adequately covered in it, leaving the CEO course time to concentrate on foreign intelligence services and operations. [redacted] pointed out that a number of people who were not actually qualified candidates have been put into the CEO course in the past simply because no other CE training was available. Although [redacted] has recognized this situation in previous conversations he did not take kindly to it today (11 April) and stated that he regarded all people who are going out to handle any form of [redacted] work as suitable for the CEO course. His objections to the treatment of operational techniques in the new course seemed to be inspired by a general review of OTR's outline rather than by attention to the notation that the emphasis in the course would be on procedures and that very limited time would be given to operational techniques. [redacted] reiterated her explanation that the outline is strictly tentative and that the time now allotted to operational techniques may very well be cut to allow even more time on procedures when the course is worked out in final form.

25X1A9a

25X1A9a

25X1C

25X1A9a

25X1A9a

5. [redacted] stated that she would welcome any ideas for an appropriate title for the course and raised the question of whether it should be labelled "CE" or "CI" since the latter term might be more accurate. She also asked for any recommendations for the handling of the course when it is run for supervisors only.

SECRET

25X1A9a

6. Mr. [REDACTED] stated that he had placed the course on the requirements list and considered that the response to date showed unusual interest and need, particularly since it is still in the planning stages. He also said that he would like to poll the branches of DDP to see whether it should be run as a half-day course for two weeks or as a full-time course for one week. The uneconomical aspects of the part-time course were pointed out but he thought the queries should go out before the course is in final form.

SECRET